

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-3 are currently pending. Claims 1 and 3, which are independent, are hereby amended. No new matter has been added. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

II. SUPPORT FOR AMENDMENT IN SPECIFICATION

Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed and specifically at paragraph [0028] of Applicant's corresponding published application.

By way of example and not limitation:

[0028] The auxiliary AV data is audio/video data whose bit rate is lower than that based on the AV data of the main line system. The auxiliary AV data is formed by compression encoding the AV data of the main line system so that its bit rate is reduced down to, for example, a few Mbps. Although a plurality of kinds of systems as well as MPEG4 exist as encoding systems for forming the auxiliary AV data, in the embodiment of the invention, the auxiliary AV data encoded by a plurality of different kinds of

encoding systems can exist mixedly on one disc. The auxiliary AV data encoded in the same encoding system by using different encoding parameters can also exist mixedly on one disc.

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,339,676 B1 to Amada et al. (hereinafter, merely "Amada") in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,075,920 to Kawamura et al. (hereinafter, merely "Kawamura") and U.S. Patent Number 5,541,739 to Tanaka (hereinafter, merely "Tanaka").

Claims 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Amada in view of Kawamura and Tanaka, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,788,881 B1 to Kuroiwa et al. (hereinafter, merely "Kuroiwa").

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

...**data forming means for forming** second video data which is data based on first video data and whose transmission rate is lower than that of said first video data, **forming second audio data by compression encoding first audio data**, said second audio data having a plurality of channels which is data based on said first audio data having zero, one, or a plurality of channels corresponding to said first video data, the number of channels of said second audio data being set to a fixed value independent of change of the number of channels of said first audio data during recording process, and whose transmission rate is lower than that of said first audio data, and outputting data of a low rate in which said second video data and said second audio data have been multiplexed... (Emphasis added)

As understood by Applicant, Tanaka relates to an audio signal recording apparatus and more particularly to an apparatus which records an audio signal as a digital signal.

Applicant submits that neither Amada nor Kawamura nor Tanaka, taken alone or in combination, that would teach or suggest the above identified features of claim 1. Specifically, none of the references used as a basis for rejection describe “**data forming means for ... forming second audio data by compression encoding first audio data**, said second audio data having a plurality of channels which is data based on said first audio data having zero, one, or a plurality of channels corresponding to said first video data, the number of channels of said second audio data being set to a fixed value independent of change of the number of channels of said first audio data during recording process, and whose transmission rate is lower than that of said first audio data ...”, as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action (see page 3) asserts that Amada teaches forming second audio data, and refers to col.13, lines 41-45 and col. 4, line 1-16, which are reproduced as follow:

Amada, col.13, lines 41-45:

On the other hand, **in the case of the long play mode in which a digital video and audio signal having a transmission bit rate which is 1/N of the standard transmission bit rate**, the recording servo circuit 41 receives the output control signal CR2 from the digital recording mode selecting circuit 52 to control the rotation speed R of rotary drum 5 to the second rotation speed R2 which is the same as that in the standard play mode and the transportation speed V of magnetic tape 6 to a transportation speed (V2/N) which is 1/N of the second transportation speed V2 in the standard play mode...”

Amada, col. 4, line 1-16:

In the figure, a luminance signal component and a chrominance signal component of an analog video signal fed from the input terminal 11 undergo FM modulation and down conversion, respectively, by means of the analog video recording signal processing circuit 12, and resulting signals are added together so as to be converted into an analog video recording signal SR1. **On the other hand, audio signal components of left/right or main/sub two channels of an analog audio signal fed from the input terminal 21 are each subjected to FM modulation by means of**

the analog audio recording signal processing circuit 22, and resulting signals are added together so as to be converted into an analog audio recording signal SR2. FIG. 2 illustrates examples of bands of the analog video recording signal SR1 and the analog audio recording signal SR2 at sections (A) and (B), respectively.

Emphasis added. Applicant submits that Amada describes that in long play mode the digital audio signal has a transmission bit rate which is $1/N$ of the standard transmission bit rate, and audio signal components of an analog audio signal that are each subjected to FM modulation and then added together. Yet nothing in Amada teaches or renders predictable any compression encoding, much less: **“forming second audio data by compression encoding first audio data, said second audio data having a plurality of channels which is data based on said first audio data having zero, one, or a plurality of channels corresponding to said first video data, the number of channels of said second audio data being set to a fixed value independent of change of the number of channels of said first audio data during recording process, and whose transmission rate is lower than that of said first audio data, and whose transmission rate is lower than that of said first audio data”**, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, this deficiency of Amada is not cured by the supplemental teaching of Kawamura or Tanaka.

Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 is patentable and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

For reasons similar to, or somewhat similar to, those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claim 3 is also patentable, and Applicant thus respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections thereto.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Applicant thereby respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of rejections thereto. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Because Applicant maintains that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicant reserves the right to address such comments.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicant respectfully requests early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 

Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
Brian M. McGuire
Reg. No. 55,445
(212) 588-0800